

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is a full and timely response to the Final Office Action dated February 18, 2009. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in this application, claims 1, 17, 18 and 21 being independent.

#### **I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

##### **1. Claims 1-6, 8-20**

Claims 1-6, 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0022994) in view of Iggulden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,882,712). The rejection is traversed for reasons set forth below.

##### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 is directed to a display device for displaying display information in a display area, the display device comprising: a display unit configured to display said display information on the display area; means, provided in the display device, for receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a read area provided in the display area of the display device; and a setting unit configured to set the relationship between the display area and the display information based on the received display control information; a display control unit configured to control said display unit to display the display information so as to be displayed in the display area, based on the display control information set by the setting unit.

Miller et al. arguably teaches a system, method and article of manufacture for generating a persona web page/web site based on user-input bar code information. Iggulden et al. arguably teaches a method and apparatus for setting programmable features of an appliance.

However, the applied art fails to disclose, teach or suggest “means, provided in the display device, for receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a data read area provided in the display area.”

Miller et al. merely teaches a bar code reader or scanner, as a means (refer to paragraph 77) which allegedly corresponds to “means, provided in the display device, for receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a data read area provided in the display area” according to the claimed invention. That is, Miller et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the bar code scanner of Miller et al. is provided in a display device, and that the display device receives information through the read area provided in the display area of the display device.

Moreover, in Iggulden et al., “data modulated on the display screen of computer 12 is sensed by optical detector 104 upon activation of receive switch 106” (column 6, lines 56-58). In addition, Iggulden et al. teaches “at least a portion of the display of the local computer may be modulated to transmit data to the transfer device” (for example, column 9, lines 57-65). Further, “a visual indication of the area of the display screen that will contain the data modulation is preferably provided (column 12, lines 64-67). Moreover, as Iggulden et al. teaches, light emitted by (or reflected by) a display panel falls on photodetector 202 (column 13, lines 63-67 and FIG. 14).

Thus, Iggulden et al. teaches light modulation on the display screen is carried out to transfer data to the transfer device or appliance (refer to column 9, lines 59-61). That is, the source of light modulation (LEDs, incandescent bulbs, LCDs and CRTs) of the Iggulden et al. (refer to column 9, lines 61-62) does not receive data, as opposed to the claimed invention in which the display device receives information through a data read area provided in the display area of the display device.

Thus, the applied art fails to disclose, teach or suggest “means, provided in the display device, for receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a data read area provided in the display area of the display device.”

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

**If the Examiner takes Official Notice in the next Office Action in terms of “means, provided in the display device, for receiving display control information”, Applicant**

**respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.**

**Claims 2-6 and 8-16**

Since claims 2-6, and 8-16 depend on claim 1, they are allowable for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

**Claims 17 and 18**

Claim 17 is directed to a display method of a display device that is capable of displaying display information in a display area of a display unit, the display method comprising the steps of: receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a read area provided in the display area of the display device; and setting the relationship between the display area and the display information based on the received display control information.

Claim 18 is directed to a storage medium for storing a computer-readable program to be executed by a computer to carry out processing, wherein said program is a display processing that is capable of displaying display information in a display area of a display unit, said program comprising the steps of: receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a read area provided in the display area of the display device; and setting the relationship between the display area and the display information, based on the received display control information; and controlling said display unit to display the display information as to be displayed in the display area, based on the display control information set in the setting step.

Similarly to claim 1, the applied art fails to disclose, teach or suggest a step of “receiving display control information emitted from an information processing terminal through a read area provided in the display area of the display device.”

Thus, claims 17 and 18 are patentable over the applied art. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

**Claims 19 and 20**

Since claims 19 and 20 depend on claim 17 and 18 respectively, they are allowable for the reasons that the respective base claims are allowable, and further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

## **2. Claim 7**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Miller et al. in view of Iggulden et al., in further view of Zimmerman et al. The rejection is traversed for reasons set forth below.

Since claim 7 depends on claim 1, claim 7 is allowable for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and further allowable by reason of the additional limitations set forth therein. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Appreciation is expressed for the indication that claim 21 contains allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim is respectfully requested.

## **III. Conclusion**

In view of the following arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicant expressly does not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

Application No. 10/671,713  
Amendment dated April 1, 2009  
After Final Office Action of February 18, 2009

Docket No.: SON-2831

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2831 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 1, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  4/1, 2009

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 21,104

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant